

**McClellan AFB Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)**  
**Meeting Transcript**  
**April 21, 1999**

**Members attending:** Elaine Anderegg, Air Force Co-Chair Alternate; Mannard Gaines; Sheila Guerra; Joe Healy, U.S. EPA; Alex MacDonald, RWQCB; Ken Peachey (Alternate for Linda Piercy); Bill Shepherd; Charles Yarbrough Sr., Community Co-Chair; Imogene Zander.

**Members not attending:** Randy Adams, DTSC; Barry Bertrand; Del Callaway; Bill Gibson; Tovey Giezentanner, Rep. Doug Ose's Office; Erwin Hayer; Anthony Piercy; Cody Tubbs, Rep. Matsui's Office.

**Others attending:** Linda Baustian, McClellan AFB; Paul Bernheisel, McClellan AFB; Mary Bridgewater, AFBCA; Merianne Briggs, McClellan AFB; Greg Challinor, TW Co.; Gary Collier, Parker Homes Neighborhood Association; Lee Lewis, Foster Wheeler; Shengjun Lu, Bitterroot Restoration; Mark Manoff, LRA; Frank Miller, Community Member; Phil Mook, McClellan AFB; Ralph Munch, McClellan AFB; Rick Solander, McClellan AFB; Sudhakar Talanki, URSG; Robert Trommer, Hydro Geologic, Jerry Vincent, McClellan AFB; Roxanne Yonn, Radian International.

TRANSCRIPT:

**INTRODUCTION, WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Before I officially start the meeting, I would like you to know what I just passed out. A lot of this information has to do with the West Area, and it has our letter addressing the environmental area on the west side. You remember the creek cleaning and the restoration mitigation plan to restore the damage to the creeks, and so forth. A little bit about EVOC is in here, too. If anybody in the audience wants some of the information I just handed out, it's up there — where the cafeteria window is. We put a number of them up there, so if you didn't get them all, help yourself.

Welcome everyone to the Restoration Advisory Board Meeting, our public meeting. We are a little bit late starting; we will go around and introduce ourselves, starting with Ken Peachy.

## Member Attendance and Sign-In

Mr. Ken Peachy: I'm Ken Peachy. I'm an alternate member on the RAB. I'm sitting in for Linda.

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Linda Piercy.

Ms. Imogene Zander: Imogene Zander.

Ms. Sheila Guerra: Sheila Guerra, Community Relations Chairperson.

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: My name is Chuck Yarbrough. I'm the Community Co-Chair for McClellan RAB.

Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. I'm here as the RAB DOD Co-Chair. Mr. Brunner was going to be here tonight, but he's in a meeting with Mr. Lowas, who is the head of the Air Force Base Conversion Agency. He said he might not make it, so we will see if he shows up.

Mr. Mannard Gaines: My name is Mannard Gaines, Community RAB Member.

Mr. Mr. Bill Sheppard: Bill Sheppard, Community RAB Member.

Mr. Alex MacDonald: Alex MacDonald. I'm with the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Mr. Joe Healy: Joe Healy, from U.S. EPA.

## **Purpose of the RAB and Ground Rules**

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. Now, we have our ground rules: Please wait until the end if you have any general comments that are not on our agenda. Please limit your comments to around three minutes. The other thing is, you can comment during a particular item on the agenda, even if you are not on the Restoration Advisory Board, if you are a community member or a member from EM, or whatever, on base. Just remember to state your name when you come up, and please come up to the microphone, so we can get it down right in the minutes. Just have common courtesy, we will show the same to you, and we will get along fine tonight. Now we get to the Air Force statement.

## **Air Force Statement**

Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. I have a statement I'd like to read. "McClellan Air Force Base is here tonight because our past industrial operations and disposal action created pollution. We regret and apologize for those actions. Although no one here in this room tonight is directly responsible for the contamination caused in the past, we are responsible for fixing it. We know we have a problem, and we are doing our best to solve it. We want your opinions and your advice. That is why we are here."

## **Approval March 3, 1999, Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. We are going to go on to the approval of the March 3, 1999 minutes. I move that we accept the minutes as written. Do we have any seconds?

Ms. Sheila Guerra: I will second that.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Seconded. All in favor, please lift up your right hand. OK. So,  
2 current news, I guess.

### 4 **Current News**

6 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. There are a couple of items we wanted to go  
7 over. One of the things we do in this time is go over any news releases that have come out since  
8 our last meeting. We had two news releases come out. One was regarding operations on the base  
9 and air emissions. There were some changes in the federal regulations which are required now.  
10 Some very low usage operations that didn't previously need permits now need to be permitted,  
11 and we put a news release out about that. Our operations were ceased until we made those  
12 applications and things are back in place at this point. It came out from the general.

14 We also put out a news release, which I saw was passed out to the RAB members tonight. It's  
15 one of those documents in the back Chuck was talking about. It's a news release about the west  
16 area project. We have been talking about the creek restoration. We did have a meeting with Fish  
17 and Wildlife, Fish and Game, as well as the U.S. EPA and Cal/EPA, the Regional Water Board,  
18 on the creek status. We had been talking at some of the recent BCT meetings that there were  
19 some very low levels of contaminants found in the creeks that we were doing an ecological  
20 assessment on. We have determined that we need to complete that ecological assessment before  
21 we can move on with the restoration project and the environmental assessment that we were  
22 doing for that restoration project. So, that has been put on hold, and we put a news release out on  
23 that, anticipating about a six-month delay while we come to a conclusion on the ecological risk  
24 assessment.

26 I do have an announcement with regard to that area; Kirsten Christopherson of my staff has taken  
27 a position at Beale Air Force Base to do their natural resource management. She will be leaving  
28

1 us in a couple of weeks. We still have an opportunity tomorrow night on the vernal pool and  
2 creek tour to meet with her and get a last chance for her expertise. We will miss her. She's been a  
3 great help moving into that role as we have had our other folks moving on.

4  
5 Were we going to go over the time line at this point?

6  
7 We did want to mention another report that has come out. I think it will be mentioned a little  
8 later as we go through our IRP reports. But we did do a five-year review. That is that process  
9 that's required as long as you don't have all the contamination cleaned up; that every five years  
10 you take a look at what you're doing in terms of the cleanup in place and make sure it is still  
11 protective. We did complete that report—the *Five Year Review* it was called—and we received a  
12 letter from U.S. EPA saying they agree with the protectiveness determination, and that has gone  
13 final. That was the first one we had done here at the base.

14  
15 We just found out today—I will make another announcement—that there is a program called the  
16 White House Closing the Circle Awards, environmental awards, that are given out. Our  
17 alternative fuel vehicle program has won one of the White House Closing the Circle Awards.  
18 That's another great step forward in recognition for our program.

19  
20 Our Electrical Vehicle Program: We are the Center for Excellence for the Air Force, will be  
21 moving at the end of this fiscal year, which is the end of September '99, to another location due  
22 to the base closure. But that's some great recognition for that program as we move it on to a new  
23 holder.

24  
25 That's all I have in the way of current news. We can go on to reviewing the action items. We  
26 have a list of them to pass out to everyone.

1 Mr. Frank Miller: Frank Miller speaking. You said we could comment on the news  
2 releases, and I have a comment. With respect, those were the two news releases that you just  
3 cited. With respect to the news release dated March 12, it says, "This team identified an  
4 immediate need for 16 administrative air quality permits from the County. Brunner says that he's  
5 proud of the fact that his people found the permit issue." I want to know why, for the past 20  
6 years, you've been derelict in having these permits? You've been in violation for decades and,  
7 suddenly now, you find that you're in violation. You're derelict in your duty to have 16 permits,  
8 and I want answers from Brunner, and I'd like answers from the regulators why the regulators did  
9 not find the need for these 16 permits.

10  
11 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: As I said, these are some very low-usage rates that we have been  
12 using, and it has not been years. But when the National Emissions Standard Hazardous Air  
13 Pollutant Regulations—that's what we call NESHAP; we have talked about in here before—  
14 went into effect this fall, it changed from the exemption we had had under the Air Districts Rule  
15 201. Where we didn't need permits, we now need permits. We identified that need. We stopped  
16 operations. We applied for the permits, and they are back into operations.

17  
18 Mr. Frank Miller: Does that apply to all 16 permits?

19  
20 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Yes, all 16 permits were because of the rule change where the  
21 NESHAP changed our exemption under 201 when it went into effect this fall.

22  
23 Mr. Frank Miller: OK.

24  
25 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Excuse me, can I get a copy of the April 16 newsletter? I didn't get  
26 one of those. Frank, did you say the April 16 newsletter?

1 Unknown Female: News release.

2  
3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: March 12.

4  
5 Mr. Frank Miller: The March 12 news release.

6  
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Where did you get the March 12...? Oh, I see. Thank you.

8  
9 Mr. Frank Miller: With respect to the news release dated April 6, it says that you just  
10 became aware of creek sediment contamination since 1994. Please be aware that in the  
11 mid-1980s, there was testing in creek sediments, and contaminants such as cyanides and heavy  
12 metals were found previously in creek sediments in the mid-1980s. So, this statement saying that  
13 you just found this in 1994 is not truthful.

14  
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: If what you are saying is true, do you know the documents they are  
16 in, those documents from the '80s?

17  
18 Mr. Frank Miller: Well, Chuck, you recall that samples were taken from the creeks  
19 back in the '80s; they did testing in the creek beds.

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Are you referring when they dug the new channel around the pits –  
22 around Pit 4?

23  
24 Mr. Frank Miller: No, not the new channels, just taking samples from Magpie Creek  
25 and other creeks.

26  
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, they did it back there when they built the channel around to  
28

1 put the cap over Pit 4 and out there in Area D—Pit S and so forth. Now, is that what you are  
2 referring to?

3  
4 Mr. Frank Miller: No, there were other sediment samples taken back in the mid-80s.  
5

6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Do you have any documents?  
7

8 Mr. Frank Miller: Well, it's in reports.  
9

10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Do you know what the name of the report is?  
11

12 Mr. Frank Miller: After the meeting, I can refresh your memory on when that  
13 happened.  
14

15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The regulators here would like to know, I'm sure, what the reports  
16 are referring to, and that's why I said it would be nice, if you don't know what the reports are  
17 now, then give it to me and I will relay it to them later.  
18

19 Mr. Frank Miller: Yes, there was testing in the creeks. Cyanides were found; heavy metals  
20 were found.  
21

22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The main thing we need to know is what the reports are, who did  
23 it—the company—and then we can look into it. Thank you.  
24

25 Ms. Imogene Zander: Excuse me, Chuck, but that was about in '85 or '86. It was when  
26 that little kid got rashes all over him from playing in the dirt, and then they started testing.  
27  
28



1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, that was when they rerouted the channel away from the pits  
2 and they found some unknown contamination in the area that they dug a new channel. Now, that  
3 is why I asked Frank, "Was that the time?" and he said, "No, there was some other time" before  
4 that, I guess. So that's why I wanted to know what documents.

5  
6 I guess it's time for a review of action items.

7  
8 **Review of Action Items**  
9

10 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: OK. The first action we had that we took from the last RAB  
11 meeting was a request for briefing on the North Creek's habitat. We are not—we have met with  
12 Fish and Wildlife, the LRA, and the Air Force together to discuss the northern creeks. We do,  
13 right now, have a letter we are putting together to send back to Fish and Wildlife. Our position  
14 still is that this area is not a high-quality habitat area, was not impacted in the way the West Area  
15 was by those actions and, thus, that's why it is not included in the EA at this time. It will be, as  
16 we discussed, part of the biological opinion that is coming.

17  
18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Excuse me. Sheila Guerra speaking. What report do we have that's  
19 available that will show that there is not that much habitat in that area?

20  
21 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: We do have a binder—Merianne, did we get that put up in the  
22 RAB area?—yeah, that we put together that I mentioned at the last RAB if you wanted to come  
23 by and see it. It's there where we have the information and literature in the AR area, with the  
24 computer, that you can take a look at.

25  
26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Is that available on the Web site if people wanted to come by and  
27 look at it?

1 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: No, those documents aren't. I have excerpts from them put in there  
2 for you if you want to come look at them.

3  
4 Ms. Sheila Guerra: What is the name of the documents?

5  
6 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: I don't have the name. There are two or three, and what I have  
7 done is pulled the excerpt pages out that are relevant to this area.

8  
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: One thing I must mention is the fact that I gave the Reuse Plan  
10 document to Joe Healy. I faxed it to him and also faxed it to U.S. Fish and Wildlife, where it  
11 does mention—and I didn't bring it tonight—but it mentions the north, northeast side of the base,  
12 where the creeks are, as being wildlife habitat. Did you get that when I faxed it to you, Joe?

13  
14 Mr. Joe Healy: Yes, I received it and passed it on to Ned Black, who is the  
15 ecologist at EPA.

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I just wanted to know. I did have documentation on that. I'm sure  
18 the County got it from EM's documents.

19  
20 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: In the next open item we had was an update on the transition plans  
21 for EM to the Air Force Base Conversion Agency that Paul was going to give. Did you get any of  
22 those slides we had? OK. That is one of the topics he's discussing right now with Mr. Lows, who  
23 I said was the SES in charge of the Air Force Base Conversion Agency. Our current discussion—  
24 I can give just a brief update as to where we are—is that we are looking right now at 21 positions  
25 converting for BCA, so they will be having 21 people working the restoration program into the  
26 future. The conversion is supposed to take place this year where people will transfer from the Air  
27 Force AFMC. That's the command that the base positions to BCA. That way they will be then

1 out of the reduction-in-force actions that are coming up, and they will have permanent positions  
2 into the future. We look to the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence—that's a service  
3 center in Texas—to start having an increased presence and support for part of the program as we  
4 do it today. They will be working a lot of the field oversight and field activities and then  
5 contracting actions into the future as well, because that's what that center does—has contracts in  
6 place that you can use. We have already started that transition where we have one person from  
7 that organization now working with Jerry Vincent overseeing our field efforts.

8  
9 This is something you would want more detail on. He'll probably have more information after  
10 this meeting today. So maybe at the next RAB, we can do it.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I would just like to ask a question: You said there are 21 positions?

13  
14 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Yes.

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And are those restoration positions?

17  
18 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Yes, those would be on AFBCA's books doing restoration work.

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Is that all they are going to have after 2001?

21  
22 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Yes, that's the plan today.

23  
24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Twenty-one restoration people. So that means the compliance  
25 people won't be around either?

26  
27 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: True, compliance people will be gone because the base mission is  
28

1 gone and that's what they support. There will be more support than just those 21 and there will  
2 be contracting positions that will be helping us that aren't on this slot; and that's where that  
3 AFCEE group comes from. They will be helping with the contracting as well as the field  
4 oversight. AFCEE will have staff on hand that are separate from that 21, but 21 folks are what  
5 will be on the AFBCA books, which are the kind of positions you see today, the people who  
6 normally do the discussions here, the RPM-type people.

7  
8 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Elaine, are you guys going to stay in the same building or are you  
9 going to get moved?

10  
11 Ms. Elaine Andereg: The current plan as I understand it is for us—the word they are  
12 using right now is implode, where organizations are coming in and compacting to vacate other  
13 buildings—to all consolidate into 269D, which is the office space that the administrative records  
14 and Paul Brunner's office are in. So, for the foreseeable future, we think we are staying in that  
15 building.

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Are any of your people going to be involved in AFBCA besides the  
18 21?

19  
20 Ms. Elaine Andereg: How AFBCA chooses to staff will be their decision. I don't know  
21 if they will choose to pick any of our folks up onto their books.

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: When was the date again on that?

24  
25 Ms. Elaine Andereg: The plan is to have that accomplished this year, which will be for  
26 us the end of the fiscal year, so by September of '99. Since the reduction in force at the base—the  
27 drawdown is taking place. The first one is this September. We would like to be able to offer  
28

1 people positions before they potentially are put out the door. The idea is to have that in place  
2 before anyone would lose their job.

3  
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: But you wouldn't have any drawdown in EM until 2000, right?

5  
6 Ms. Elaine Anderegg Correct. The rest of the folks that are on the AFMC books today,  
7 we have full manning until September of '00. And that's when you'll see a large drawdown in the  
8 environmental management folks, down to about 40 people, which includes this 21 in that count  
9 going on from October 1, '00 to July of '01 to when the base actually closes.

10  
11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So, is that 40 including AFBCA people?

12  
13 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: No, it does not include any AFBCA folks. It's the BCA slots plus  
14 the remaining AFMC slots to make sure that all the compliance issues are wrapped up.

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So that's another 19 people, right? So are they going to stay around  
17 past the closure date?

18  
19 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: No, by 2001 there will be no AFMC slots. The only people left at  
20 the base will be on the BCA slots; it's that 21.

21  
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you.

23  
24 Merianne Briggs: Merianne Briggs. Does Elaine's answer satisfy this particular item  
25 or would you rather keep it open?

26  
27 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I'd like to have them as you go along in case there are changes or  
28

1 something. Maybe we ought to get updated as the changes happen? So I would say leave it open.

2  
3 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: OK. The next item was to invite a representative from the U.S.  
4 Fish and Wildlife Service to participate in our RAB training when we discuss the biological  
5 opinion. The biological opinion was originally anticipated to be done this summer, but with the  
6 ecological risk now slowing the environmental assessment for the creek restoration down, we are  
7 going to do that work before the biological opinion comes out. So, the biological opinion right  
8 now is thought to be coming out sometime in the fall. So that training will be postponed until the  
9 fall when that is done and we will invite them.

10  
11 OK, the last item on this first page is to update the RAB fact sheet on the Web site. Merianne, do  
12 you have an update on that?

13  
14 Ms. Merianne Briggs: At the last Community Relations Committee meeting, we did go  
15 ahead and take a look at the write up for the Restoration Advisory Board—the description of it.  
16 And the members of the committee asked that it be postponed—the final decision on that be  
17 postponed until the next meeting. We will go ahead and address it on the next agenda for the  
18 Community Relations Committee meeting.

19  
20 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: OK, the second page, the first item is to discuss the need for an  
21 alternate RAB membership application as mentioned in the By-laws, and Sheila, this is yours.

22  
23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Del Callaway is still working that, and we will be talking about  
24 that. It will stay an action item until the next CR meeting.

25  
26 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: OK, the next one we had was to assist Imogene Zander and the  
27 Piercys in obtaining base passes. And we are still available to help do that when you'd like to  
28

1 come and get them.

2  
3 And the last one we had was to set up a meeting with Rebecca Garrison on the Ride Share  
4 Program, and that was yours, Sheila. And I believe at the last RAB, you mentioned you would...

5  
6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's closed.

7  
8 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: OK, Chuck, it's yours.

9  
10 **NOMINATING COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS**

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. I have a Wetlands and Remediation Conference coming up  
13 November 16 through 17, and so I will just give this to the community members.

14  
15 Well, I'm going to say—I want to clear this up since we are going to go into the next item on the  
16 agenda—is the nominee committee. The elections and so forth, Community Co-Chair. I wanted  
17 everybody to know how many we have officially on our RAB now. And I wanted you to know  
18 that Erwin Hayer has family problems, so he had just come on board for very limited time and  
19 then stepped out. So right now, we have 10 Restoration Advisory Board members and two  
20 alternates.

21  
22 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Merianne Briggs. Excuse me, Chuck. Was Erwin requested to  
23 submit something in writing to us for the file?

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: As far as I know—you could go and look at the Charter, but I don't  
26 think there is anything required that somebody submit it in writing. But he did resign. He not  
27 only called me, but he called Del Callaway. I don't know if he called anyone else on the Board.

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Chuck, excuse me. Sheila Guerra speaking. On our RAB  
2 application, I think there is something on there that says that you put it in writing.

3  
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes, but that's not in our Charter, and By-laws, and RAB's Rules  
5 Order.

6  
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: OK. I thought I might be mistaken. But I thought it was in the RAB  
8 application, the original RAB application, and I know we are working on that.

9  
10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: An application would not force somebody to do that. Really, even  
11 if you put it on your charter, By-laws, and RAB Rules Order, how would you force somebody to  
12 submit a letter of resignation?

13  
14 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I know we don't need to force anyone, but it's just...

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, most people do, but Erwin did not. Now, whether he will  
17 submit one at a later date, I cannot tell you.

18  
19 Ms. Sheila Guerra: OK.

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: But, for voting purposes tonight, he did contact me as Community  
22 Co-Chair, and he did contact Del Callaway.

23  
24 Mr. Bill Gibson: Bill Gibson. The Charter says, "Members unable to participate  
25 shall submit their resignation in writing."

26  
27 Ms. Sheila Guerra: OK, I heard it someplace. I mean, I read it.



1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. So what do I do, count him as a member until he puts it in  
2 writing?

3  
4 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I think we should contact him and ask him to give us something in  
5 writing, even if it is one sentence, or whatever the case. He could—he has the facility—he could  
6 e-mail Chuck or Merianne.

7  
8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Would you do that?

9  
10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I can contact him and ask him to do that, yes.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So, the only difference is, that means we have 11 RAB members  
13 right now and we would have—what—still six members to make—is that six or seven?—six  
14 members to have a quorum, a majority plus one out of 11 would be six, right? OK. And we do  
15 have that number, so we are all right. But also, we do have two members that are—and I'm not  
16 even counting the two members that are not in good standing. So even with that, we still have a  
17 quorum—not counting them off. So, I needed to address that, so now we can allow Sheila  
18 Guerra—oh, by the way, I should say this, Del Callaway is not here tonight with us because he is  
19 out of town on business. So, without further ado, I'm going to turn it over to Sheila Guerra, who  
20 has been acting as the chair of our Nominating Committee, and she can handle it from here.

21  
22 Ms. Sheila Guerra: OK. Our nominee is Del Callaway, and he was the only nominee,  
23 so he's the one who is going to be voted on tonight. I believe I will turn it back over to you to—  
24 are you taking the vote?

25  
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I will just let you run the vote since you're the chair.

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Would someone like to make the motion to accept Mr. Callaway as  
2 our Co-Chair?

3  
4 Ms. Imogene Zander: I will make the motion that we accept him.

5  
6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Is there a second on that?

7  
8 Mr. Mannard Gaines: I will second the motion.

9  
10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: OK. Those in favor, raise your right hand. So I take it from here;  
11 we have a new Co-Chair and he's not here tonight. I'd like to say a few words about our Co-  
12 Chair tonight, Mr. Chuck Yarbrough.

13  
14 Chuck has given a lot of his time, and his family has given a lot of their time, and I'd like to  
15 thank you for that, Chuck. And all the hours and days, weeks, and months you've put into this  
16 RAB since the early '80s; we all appreciate that. We appreciate the work and that you'll stay with  
17 us and help us along the way with the TAPP Program and the other committees that you are  
18 chairing right now. So thank you.

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you very much for those kind words. I would like to say one  
21 thing on the encouraging side of our membership. We did have a membership table at the Creek  
22 Week. The meal they threw after everybody went down and cleaned the tons of garbage out of  
23 the creeks. And we had a table there—a Restoration Advisory Board table, and we have at least  
24 two names that were turned into us there that are interested in being RAB members. We had  
25 another two who took applications. So out of that, maybe we will get some more RAB people on  
26 our Board, which would be good.

1 So, without further ado, we will just go into Community Relations Committee reports.

2  
3 Ms. Elaine Andereg: The other action was for the committees to confirm their chairs.  
4 Are you going to do that at the next meeting or did that take place?

5  
6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That hasn't taken place yet.

7  
8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: It should have. That was my fault.

9  
10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I'm sorry. I think that's going to happen in October.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: We can do that in our June meeting. We can confirm.

13  
14 Ms. Sheila Guerra: June, yes, that is the next...

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Between now and June, everybody can confirm their chairs or put  
17 in a new chair of that committee, whatever turns up.

18  
19 Ms. Sheila Guerra: OK.

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Does anybody have a problem with that? (Pause.) OK, very good.

22  
23 Ms. Merianne Briggs: For the record, the vote to have Del Callaway as the Community  
24 Co-Chair was seven out of seven members present.

25  
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you. Now we can go into Community Relation reports.

## 1 COMMITTEE REPORTS

### 3 Community Relations

5 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Our last Community Relation Committee met on March 17. Our  
6 minutes have been approved. We have one committee that we have some changes on meeting  
7 minutes that we haven't yet approved, and we will do that at our June 16 meeting.

9 And Mr. Callaway is also working a new worksheet or a new application for the format of  
10 membership exclusions for the RAB applications. That's being worked, and also the description  
11 for the Web, and Merianne Briggs already updated you on that; you've already been updated on  
12 Erwin Hayer. I will contact him.

14 That's about it for the Community Relations, except I'd like to mention that I did participate in  
15 the Creek Week and it was great this year. I feel that the Urban Creek Council and McClellan got  
16 us that table this year out there, and we had a really good turnout on that. I recommend we do it  
17 again, if possible, next year. We had a lot of people interested in it.

19 Also, we had another Arbor Day on Monday, and EM participated in that also. Awards were  
20 made and I forgot the guy's name—I'm sorry. He was with the Forest Department—is that  
21 correct?

23 Ms. Merianne Briggs: That was Bill Fiedler from the California Department of Forestry  
24 and Fire Protection.

26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yes. And they had a lot of things out there. The Scouts had some  
27 posters, and they had some awards for the posters; they had candy and cookies, and they just had

1 a great time. It turned out really good. They had some pretty nice trees this year, not the itty-bitty  
2 twiggy things we had the year before.

3  
4 Also, I want to mention that we are going to have a vernal pool tour tomorrow. If you haven't  
5 been on the vernal pool tour, I suggest you try to make it out there. It's very interesting. It might  
6 be a little different from last year from what I understand.

7  
8 And the other things I wanted to comment on are what's going on. Mr. Callaway asked me to  
9 keep in touch with what's going on with the Board of Supervisors and the bidders on McClellan  
10 Air Force Base. I have two packets already that I received from two of the three bidders, and  
11 Mark Manoff is going to see that we get another copy of the other bidder.

12  
13 Mr. Mark Manoff: (Inaudible.)

14  
15 Ms. Sheila Guerra: OK, go ahead.

16  
17 Mr. Mark Manoff: Mark Manoff, Department of Military Base Conversion,  
18 Sacramento County. Yesterday, the Board of Supervisors heard the three developmental parts of  
19 the proposals—a 4-1/2-hour hearing. Basically, the hearing was comprised of the presentations  
20 that each of the development partners presented. There was some public testimony at that  
21 hearing, but the items continued until next Tuesday at 2 o'clock, if anybody wishes to speak on  
22 that. That's the time of the public hearing, and anyone can make a comment. You have the two  
23 proposals, with one outstanding (inaudible) and those proposals are available to any member of  
24 the public.

25  
26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Thank you, Mark. Now I'd like to say one other thing pertaining to  
27 this: I feel if the RAB would like to do so, we also give public input, so that's what I'm asking  
28

1 you tonight, Mr. Chair.

2  
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. Do you want to have some kind of motion that the Restoration  
4 Advisory Board provide public input through the process of choosing...?

5  
6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: We don't have a lot of time. From what I understand, a lot of  
7 public input is going to happen on Tuesday, and they may not make their decision even by  
8 Tuesday. So, we may buy some time. I do have the two here tonight. I have already reviewed one,  
9 so I'm willing to give one to whoever would like to look at it. We could kind of pass them  
10 around and whoever is interested in the input on it, then I think we should have a little discussion  
11 on that right now.

12  
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So they have three contractors bidding for the work to—I guess—  
14 for work for McClellan to move in industries and companies and—basically a real estate firm,  
15 like Stanford Ranch, that would oversee the development of McClellan and the reuse of it.

16  
17 Ms. Sheila Guerra: The other one was Potter Taylor, and the other one—Mark, what  
18 was the name of the other?

19  
20 Mr. Mark Manoff: There are three development partners that sent in proposals to the  
21 County. One of them is (inaudible) a Florida-based residential development company. Potter  
22 Taylor, which is a local real estate commercial development company, and they have partnered  
23 with a company called IRG, who are industrial redevelopers and have done a variety of projects  
24 across the country. And the third group is Stanford Ranch, partnered with Morgan Stanley and  
25 Kaufman and Broad. Larry Kelley is the president of that group, and he is a developer of  
26 Stanford Ranch, which is a Rocklin 3,000-acre development. And it's a mixed-use development.  
27 The County recommended one of the three equity development partners, and that is Stanford  
28

1 Ranch. The recommendation was basically based on a system with a reviewing committee.

2  
3 The criteria was primarily experience in equity; in other words, bringing money to the base for  
4 redevelopment. It was not based on a final reuse plan, which we are really not engaged with right  
5 now and hope to get started with that. They will be integrated into that process—whoever is  
6 selected by the Board of Supervisors. So the process is just the staff—the LRA made a  
7 recommendation for Stanford Ranch. The Board of Supervisors will have to basically make a  
8 decision on one of those three. So that's where we are and that's what these hearings taking place  
9 right now are about.

10  
11 But it is not a reuse plan. It's basically an equity development partner who will not only market  
12 the base for reuse but also bring equity. That's basically the nutshell. If you would like to give  
13 testimony, review the proposals at the Board of Supervisors hearing, which is next Tuesday. It's  
14 a good chance that they won't make a decision at that point, but the chair of the Board of  
15 Supervisors basically went on record to say hopefully within a month. The reason for that is the  
16 importance of getting on with our reuse planning effort and also getting going on our  
17 development partner in beginning to market the base.

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you very much, Mark. Any other questions of Mark while  
20 he's up here? I guess not.

21  
22 Ms. Sheila Guerra: One other thing: I understand after the Board of Supervisors makes  
23 their decision, the Planning Team will come back and, at some point then, we will be looking at  
24 the vision of whomever the bidder is.

25  
26 Mr. Mark Manoff: That's correct. We will. Simultaneously to this process, we have  
27 formulated a draft scope of work for our consultant firm, EDAW, who worked on the Refine  
28

1 Reuse Plan. They are a Bay Area planning consultant firm. And the way it will work is,  
2 hopefully, we will have the development partner and they have reviewed the scope of work – all  
3 three of them. And the Planning Team will re-engage and get back on the final reuse planning.  
4 That process should take about nine months and will include all kinds of public input and public  
5 hearings, including RAB input as the Refine Reuse Plan did.

6  
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's great.

8  
9 Ms. Imogene Zander: After they've already made up their minds?

10  
11 Mr. Mark Manoff: The Board of Supervisors hasn't made up their minds yet. That's  
12 what these hearings are for.

13  
14 Ms. Imogene Zander: Well, yes...

15  
16 Ms. Sheila Guerra: So, if you want to give input, that's what we are discussing now.

17  
18 Mr. Mark Manoff: This is the time to give input. We, the staff, made a  
19 recommendation that was based on what we thought was the best candidate bringing equity to the  
20 base redevelopment and their experience in development. So, the Board of Supervisors is the  
21 ultimate decision maker and they make their decision based not only on staff recommendation,  
22 but also community input and, of course, the presentations being made by the developers.

23  
24 Ms. Imogene Zander: Well, they will have their minds made up then. What good would it  
25 do to even say anything?

26  
27 Mr. Mark Manoff: Public input does count for something. This process is set up for  
28



1 your input.

2  
3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Imogene, let me explain something here. The more input we give  
4 now, the better it will be in the future, because whatever bidder is accepted will know who the  
5 RAB is. You know, I have already talked to several of the bidders and they really didn't know  
6 who the RAB was. Now we have actually introduced ourselves. So if we have the opportunity to  
7 review their packets, I think it's a good idea for us to give some type of input. We don't  
8 necessarily have to say we want one particular bidder, but we can comment as a RAB. That's  
9 basically what I'm looking at.

10  
11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So this is what this is all about, Imogene. We can have an input, if  
12 that's what you want.

13  
14 Mr. Mark Manoff: And it could be an individual input or it could be as a RAB, as a  
15 RAB member representing the RAB, however you want to give your input.

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And while you're up there, Mark, I gave out the letter from City  
18 regarding the EVOC area and their request to look at the area between the two taxiways into the  
19 interior of the base.

20  
21 Mr. Mark Manoff: Correct.

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Hey, we've got to get on with business here. I was asking him a  
24 question about EVOC and I gave you a letter regarding the City's—I don't know if it's a  
25 recommendation or what—that they put it between the two taxiways, more toward the center of  
26 the base rather than on an environmental wetland area on the west side.

1 Mr. Mark Manoff: That's correct. The letters that you have there really involve several  
2 different issues including a relocation of the EVOC based not only on RAB input and community  
3 input to their concerns in the West Area, but also the knowledge that Fish and Wildlife will  
4 probably recommend the laying over of the conservation easement in this area. So the City is  
5 now looking at alternative sites, including the west side of the runway, as a possible alternatives.  
6 And again this is a—we haven't seen anything definitive as to an alternative location. I see that  
7 letter as a formal request to remove their interest in the West Area.

8  
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I know Jane Steele said that she got some formal word from the  
10 Sheriff's Department that they didn't want to put it there anymore. Is that correct?

11  
12 Mr. Mark Manoff: This is all I have but, basically, the city is spear heading this  
13 project in conjunction with the Sheriff's Department. This letter's the only thing I have received.

14  
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So you don't have anything from the emergency vehicle people at  
16 all, right? Like the sheriff, police, fire department...?

17  
18 Mr. Mark Manoff: Basically, just the city police—the city.

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So you haven't heard any—they haven't heard—no one has heard  
21 anything from these people that they are actually looking at another area?

22  
23 Mr. Mark Manoff: This is the city.

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes, I know that's the city.

26  
27 Mr. Mark Manoff: That's the city.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Are they speaking for the city police?

2  
3 Mr. Mark Manoff: They are speaking for the city police. That letter is from Assistant  
4 City Manager, Jack Frisk.

5  
6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes.

7  
8 Mr. Mark Manoff: And Tom Lee and basically, that's....

9  
10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So basically they are talking for the police too.

11  
12 Mr. Mark Manoff: Exactly.

13  
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK, well, I didn't know, that's why...

15  
16 Mr. Mark Manoff: I know—and that's why I was a little reluctant to give you the letter  
17 because it involves the river dock and there are other issues in there. But what it does outline is  
18 their intent to relocate their current interest in the West Area to a different part of the base. We  
19 haven't seen a map that indicates where, but there is a verbal description of the area they are  
20 interested in. And I reported that to the RAB Reuse Committee a couple weeks ago.

21  
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I only had you reiterate that because there were some members  
23 here that were not at that meeting.

24  
25 Mr. Mark Manoff: And if you read that letter, it is a little confusing, but the key part is  
26 the location of the alternative.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I also gave you a map of the proposed conservation easement. And  
2 there has been talk of even extending that all the way up to Ascot, so that's why you got all that  
3 documentation on your desk tonight.

4  
5 Thank you very much, Mark, I appreciate it.

6  
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Thank you.

8  
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And so, what I would say as far as the different contractors for  
10 building up the base: What you need to do is make it into a motion and have someone second it.

11  
12 Ms. Sheila Guerra: OK. I would like to make a motion that the RAB give input to the  
13 Board of Supervisors on the bidders sometime next week; I believe it's Tuesday at 2 o'clock.  
14 Somebody want to second it?

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Does somebody want to second that motion?

17  
18 Ms. Imogene Zander: I will second it, but I'm not going to it.

19  
20 Ms. Sheila Guerra: OK. We are going to make that decision in a minute, if we get a  
21 vote.

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: All in favor of that motion—yes, oh yes discussion. I should be in  
24 discussion. Go ahead.

25  
26 Mr. Bill Sheppard: Bill Sheppard. I'm curious of what, I mean, I'm all for giving  
27 public input. I'm curious about giving input as a RAB. How you're going to, sometime between  
28

1 now and Tuesday, get some sort of ratification or consensus among the other RAB members that  
2 whoever is giving input is giving input that is truly representative of the RAB.

3  
4 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I think we should choose, you know, whoever wants to be involved  
5 in the input should be the group that reviews the documents. And then somebody out of that  
6 group will give input for the RAB.

7  
8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, what I would suggest doing is having the people who are  
9 working make you the chair forming the ad hoc committee.

10  
11 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Ad hoc committee?

12  
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: You could be the chair, and anybody interested could join that ad  
14 hoc committee. And then the least you people need to do is contact everyone by phone and tell  
15 them what your recommendation to the Board of Supervisors will be before we come up with  
16 a—you know you will have...

17  
18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Would you like me to withdraw that action and make another  
19 motion?

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, your motion is fine. We are just saying how we would do this.  
22 In other words, you would have to have at least a majority of the RAB to proceed on saying this  
23 is a RAB recommendation.

24  
25 Mr. Bill Sheppard: Chuck, I have three more questions. Bill Sheppard speaking. I  
26 guess I'm sort of hunting for whether or not the objective is just simply to make our presence  
27 known in this decision-making process and not really take a position. I mean, I think that may be  
28

1 a preferable option.

2  
3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I agree.

4  
5 Mr. Bill Sheppard: Because I don't know if we are qualified to assess these...

6  
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: No, this is just an opportunity...

8  
9 Mr. Bill Sheppard: ...vendors.

10  
11 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Because the bidders have been gracious enough to give us the  
12 information. You know, they didn't really have to. It didn't become public until, I think, today or  
13 something like that—public, where people can just go down and get it, but they actually  
14 delivered these. So it was just gracious of the bidders to give it to us, you know. I just feel that  
15 they have given us some thought to it, and for us to...

16  
17 Mr. Bill Sheppard: I think we should take advantage of that. But my preference would  
18 be not to take a position because I'm not sure that we are qualified, number one and number two,  
19 that we would be able to give it justice between now and Tuesday, you know, to assess what  
20 looks like pretty comprehensive plans if those packets are the size of it. But, rather, take the  
21 opportunity to say we are the RAB and explain what we do, explain why we are interested, and  
22 explain that we support the process, etc.

23  
24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's fine with me. I don't have any problem with it.

25  
26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Exactly, yes.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And if they decide that there is no need for us to address the  
2 supervisors, then they don't have to do that either. But they need to have at least the majority of  
3 us agree to proceed saying this is a RAB. Does that sound right?  
4

5 Mr. Bill Sheppard: I'm prepared to support it right now. We could give somebody just  
6 carte blanche authority to just do sort of a "PR" sort of thing, if that's going to be the objective  
7 and making ourselves known and trying to get our foot in the door of the process in some small  
8 way rather than taking a position. If we think we are going to take some position, or object to one  
9 decision, then I think we need to have consensus among ourselves.  
10

11 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's right.  
12

13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, the thing is, do you want to know regardless, or if we don't  
14 take position, you don't care, what?  
15

16 Mr. Bill Sheppard: That's just the bottom line. If we are not taking a position, I don't  
17 care. Logistically, I think you're going to be hard-pressed to get a group of people to look this  
18 over to form some opinion about it unless it is just some staff opinion.  
19

20 Ms. Sheila Guerra: It's not really—I have already gone through one plan and,  
21 basically, it just tells about the people on the team, who's involved, what their vision might be in  
22 the future, what their ideas are, and when they have different ideas, as far as the reuse. Regarding  
23 privatizing of the base, they each have a little bit of a different plan. If they have the money to  
24 back them, how are they being backed in this sort of thing?  
25

26 Mr. Bill Sheppard: Maybe this is a forum where we should just emphasize our agenda,  
27 which you know is what we do. We want to make sure that restoration continues and, no matter  
28

1 who takes it over, that environmental cleanup is received at the appropriate track; that if some of  
2 the things we have already taken position on are creek cleanup or things that we have already  
3 discussed as a RAB, I think that would be appropriate to let everybody know that we are  
4 concerned about those and want to make sure that these bidders understand that.

5  
6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Also, our stand as far as the wetland area goes is to preserve it.  
7 Yes, that is fine with me. Is that the kind of thing you are looking at?

8  
9 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Right. I'm not in the position to go up there and say, oh well, we  
10 want...

11  
12 **End of Tape**

13  
14 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Would the RAB like to participate in giving public input on the  
15 bidders at the next Board of Supervisors meeting before they make a decision?

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. All those in favor, lift your right hand.

18  
19 Ms. Merianne Briggs: The vote was seven out of seven.

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Sheila, do you have anything else?

22  
23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yes I do. Merianne, the newsletter. I wanted to mention that  
24 because we didn't receive that. Also, the *Community Relations Plan* final is out. And I'm not  
25 sure when I'm going to get a copy of that or who's going to get it, but that is in place. Also, I will  
26 come back to that, Merianne. I want to go over these Restoration Advisory Board applications we  
27 received from Creek Week: Mike Lynch of Rio Linda and Cheryl Stokely of Rio Linda. We will  
28



1 need to get some invitations out to them to participate at the next Community Relations Meeting  
2 on the 16<sup>th</sup>.

3  
4 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Merianne Briggs. I will go ahead and contact them and invite them  
5 to the meeting.

6  
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: OK. Thank you, and that's all I have.

8  
9 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Sheila, this is Elaine Anderegg. You say the next Community  
10 Relations Meeting is on June 16?

11  
12 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Correct.

13  
14 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Which is after the June RAB Meeting, and we were going to  
15 confirm chairs at the June RAB Meeting. I just wonder if you realize that so I don't know if you  
16 want to speed it up or if you guys want make another decision about when you're going to  
17 confirm chairs. When I heard you say the 16<sup>th</sup>...

18  
19 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Oh, it will probably be that following RAB after that.

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: You have only the Community Relations Meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup>?

22  
23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Right.

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. Well, evidently, we are going to have to make this July before  
26 we have a—I didn't realize—that's right, we don't have committee meetings until June, so...

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: One other thing, I have to go back again. On this Board of  
2 Supervisors thing, would someone like to go before the Board of Supervisors? We didn't make a  
3 decision on that yet.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, you're the chair of the ad hoc committee, so if you could  
6 discuss that among your committee people? And, by the way, if you are interested in working  
7 with Sheila on this recommendation to the supervisors, please see her after tonight's RAB.

8  
9 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Right, because I have one report that one of you could start  
10 reviewing.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Please see Sheila.

13  
14 Ms. Sheila Guerra: And I don't know when Mark's going to get me the other bidder's  
15 packet, you said? OK, great.

16  
17 **Base/Reuse Relative Risk Ranking Committee**

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Now we have the Reuse/Relative Risk Ranking Committee, but  
20 Del Callaway is not here, plus we just went through much of that already. So I guess we will go  
21 on to the Technical Report Review.

22  
23 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. If you're interested, I believe Rick Solander is  
24 prepared to just go through that thing that he passed out at the BCT, which was covered at that  
25 meeting, as well as if there were any interests on the radiation sites which were discussed at that  
26 meeting, or the budget that was discussed at that meeting. We can do that. It's your choice.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: We will take Rick right now. We will give him a roaring hand of  
2 applause here.

3  
4 Mr. Rick Solander: Every month, Environmental Management meets with folks on the  
5 base in what we call the BRAC Cleanup Team. And during that meeting, we discuss the support  
6 efforts that Environmental Management is doing to help property transfer, as well as to help LRA  
7 transfer property to the local redevelopment authority. So what I wanted you here for tonight is to  
8 kind of walk through some of the efforts the Environmental Management office is doing to  
9 support the Air Force Base Conversion Agency to transfer property to the County of Sacramento.

10  
11 What you should be getting in your handout is not only the activities that we are actively  
12 supporting, but some of those things that are on the horizon that we could be supporting in the  
13 future. The Local Redevelopment Authority, County of Sacramento, is in the process of trying to  
14 screen out whether or not the effort is going to be viable. That's why you see it in the bottom tier.  
15 The second page of the handout you got shows that the top tier is basically what I'm going to talk  
16 about. The bottom tier shows those efforts that are kind of in the hopper, and they could move to  
17 the top tier if the interest is enough that the LRA wants to entertain it.

18  
19 So with that in mind and what you see before you, those are the efforts that BRAC could be  
20 supporting. The first one is what we call the North Area Transfer Station. The Public Works from  
21 the County of Sacramento has been operating out there at the North Area Transfer Station since  
22 about the mid-60s. We are in the process of entertaining a lease for that. The Environmental  
23 Management office has completed the environmental documentation to effect a property transfer.  
24 The lease package is up at the Air Force Base Conversion Agency Headquarters for final  
25 signature, as we speak. So, that one should be consummated here probably within the next 30  
26 days.

1 I have listed the issues associated with each effort, and for that one, there are some sensitive  
2 habitats near the entrance of the North Area Transfer Station that will require us to put a  
3 restriction on the development of that area until Public Works obtains what we call a 404 permit  
4 from the Corps of Engineers to fill those sensitive habitats, if they are going to construct in that  
5 area. Through that process, they will be consulting with the Fish and Wildlife Services for the  
6 endangered species or threatened species that might be in that sensitive habitat.

7  
8 The second effort has to do with what we call a 1000 series building. That's out where—for  
9 those of you who are familiar with the base and the 940 Division occupied some facilities—  
10 1028, 1027, along the flight line. So those are vacant right now. We are in the process of  
11 preparing the documentation to transfer that. The issue associated with that is that there is one  
12 building out there that had some rad storage in the past, so we have to do some surveys out there  
13 and clear that before we can actually transfer possession.

14  
15 The third item there is a building that Boeing Service Company wants to occupy to continue their  
16 support mission on the base, so that just happens to be Building 271. That does happen to be a  
17 historic building, so until we get the programmatic agreement signed by the State Historic  
18 Preservation Office, we won't be transferring possession of that property. That document should  
19 be signed within the next 30 days, so we expect that lease to fall through and come to fruition in  
20 the next 60 days.

21  
22 The river dock you heard mentioned a little bit today in the letter that got passed out by Chuck is  
23 an area that I believe the city wants to take on and is in the process of preparing the  
24 environmental documentation for that. There is an elderberry bush out there underneath the dock  
25 that we are going to have to place some restrictions on. That is also a historic piece of property  
26 that we will have to work as we did with 271 through the programmatic agreement.

1 A new one since we last spoke is the nuclear reactor. UC Davis is interested in Building 258's  
2 reactor for some research they are doing. So we are in the process of preparing the documentation  
3 for that. The only issue there is what hoops we have to go through to transfer the radiation permit  
4 over to UC Davis, so we are working through those issues as we speak.

5  
6 Fire training area. I don't think I had this there last time, but we pretty much talked through this  
7 over a year ago. This project went kind of in limbo for about a year while the attorneys were  
8 working through the language on the document. This happens to be a license at this point and not  
9 a lease. If you recall, out on the western side of base—just east of where the West Area  
10 mitigation project is happening—the American River Fire District wants to set up a regional fire  
11 training center there. This centered phase one is north of where all the landfills are, so they are  
12 going to be restricted from developing anything south of where the landfill starts. What's  
13 significant about this one is, since we last talked about it, we have discovered some vernal pools  
14 out there—some wetlands and some vernal pools. So, we are going to be placing some  
15 restrictions on those and they will have to work around that for their development. That one is  
16 probably going to start within the next 30 days also.

17  
18 The last one is what we will refer to as Group One facilities. Mark Manoff from the County  
19 talked a little about the redevelopment partners and their effort to put together a reuse plan for the  
20 future use of the base. Along with that, before new companies can come on and develop the  
21 entire base, we have to do the environmental baseline survey. I have been talking about those in  
22 an effort we just described. But we have to do that for the whole base and we have to do that  
23 before closure, and we have over 1,000 facilities that we have to do that for. We have taken all  
24 the facilities on base and broken them up into eight basic groups to try to lump them in logical  
25 areas to enable us to get those done before base closure.

26  
27 So, Group One consists of about 80 facilities. There is a group of facilities in the 600 series on  
28

1 the southern part of the base, the 300 series on the eastern part of the base, and there are some  
2 vacated family housing, or barracks, up in the 500 series of the base that constitutes the Group  
3 One facilities. We are in the process of doing environmental baseline surveys on those facilities  
4 right now, and we are hoping that, shortly after we get done with those, which is scheduled to be  
5 completed in the fall, we will be able to transfer those facilities to the County of Sacramento.

6  
7 So, those are the efforts Environmental Management is doing to support the Air Force Base  
8 Conversion Agency right now. I do want to make the point that the Air Force is not in a position  
9 to advocate in any of these reuse efforts. Because, all we are is in a support role to make sure the  
10 environmental documentation, disclosures, and restrictions are in place to make sure we protect  
11 the health and safety in any future usage of the base. Any questions?

12  
13 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. The other topics we discussed were some  
14 information on the radiation sites on base and the budget. Both of those were topics I did discuss  
15 at the last RAB and we went into some more details in the committee. We do have a poster board  
16 over here; depending on whether you all want to spend time on that now or not, it's your choice.  
17 We are prepared to talk about it, but if you want we do have this poster board and if people are  
18 interested in more detail, they could stop after the meeting.

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So, what is your desire? Do you want to discuss it now or for all  
21 those who are interested to discuss it after the meeting—I mean to go over there and review the  
22 poster board?

23  
24 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: And we will be available to talk to you.

25  
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I'm listening; does anybody have any ideas?

1 Ms. Imogene Zander: The only thing I saw in there, excuse me. Imogene Zander. The  
2 only thing I saw in there was that radiation permit. In other words, the more permits you buy, the  
3 more people you can radiate.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, basically, the only thing I know of is the number of sites  
6 have increased and the area has enlarged a little bit. But our recommendation as a RAB was to  
7 haul the contaminated radiated soil off base by the shortest means, you know, like a straight line.  
8 We gave them a couple of gates: One was off Winters Avenue on the extreme south side of the  
9 base and one was Roosevelt Road, as being the most direct routes that would not go by housing  
10 and residential places. It's just low-level radioactive material.

11  
12 So that's all we had as a RAB to recommend. Do you want to talk to it in-depth? I don't know  
13 what to go over. Well, I see it's no real excitement here, so we will just go on.

14  
15 Ms. Elaine Andereg: We will be available if anyone wants to get some more information  
16 on what was discussed at the committee. We can move on then.

17  
18 **Technical Report Review**

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK, we want to go over to the Technical Report Review  
21 Committee. Basically, what we want to talk about tonight is the Technical Assistance Program  
22 (TAPP) grants. I'm wondering if Ralph or you or Linda brought that document so every RAB  
23 person can have one. What is that? Does that state "Statement of Work" or "Statement of  
24 Objectives?"

25  
26 Ms. Merianne Briggs: We do have copies of the Statement of Work.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Good, if each RAB person could get ahold of it, what we need here  
2 is to give these out to you—to the RAB members, community folks—let you look over it and  
3 basically give us a concurrence. We have to have half of the RAB members, a majority of the  
4 RAB members, agree this is a direction you want us to go as far as obtaining the TAPP grant.

5  
6 Linda, if you or Ralph could come forth and explain. One thing I would like to know is with  
7 Kelly Air Force Base, theirs is titled *Statement of Objectives* and here, it's a *Statement of Work* or  
8 SOW.

9  
10 Ms. Linda Baustian: Linda Baustian, the contracting office. The reason we try to correct it is  
11 that in different places in the Kelly document, they sometimes called it a "Statement of Work"  
12 and sometimes they called it a "Statement of Objectives." What we felt was more appropriate  
13 was the "Statement of Work" because, in the basic document, you're trying to explain what work  
14 you actually want BPA contractors to do for you. When you issue a SOO, you tell them what  
15 your goals are and they come back to you with their proposed plan for achieving those goals. We  
16 didn't see that as quite as appropriate for this document and for what you had wanted out of the  
17 TAPP program.

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK, could you address...

20  
21 Ms. Linda Baustian: The two documents you have there?

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes.

24  
25 Ms. Linda Baustian: What you have there is the Kelly document that has been modified  
26 to reflect those things that are particular to McClellan. We have gone through and updated the  
27 regulatory information, cleaned up some of the language we had talked about during the  
28



1 committee meeting; and that second document you have incorporates a lot of early discussions  
2 we had regarding the TAPP program and what you had wanted in that program and with Mr.  
3 Callaway and yourself.

4  
5 Additionally, there is a list of acronyms I thought might be useful for you, the committee, and for  
6 the vendors that you choose to award to. Again, they are recommendations, things I typically see  
7 in Statements of Work I thought you might be interested in. It was based on my personal  
8 experience. These are things I thought you might be interested in including.

9  
10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. Thank you. Basically, we found out another way to approach  
11 this TAPP program, where we can come up with a list that goes out with a general Statement of  
12 Work to the companies saying generally what we would like them to do, and then, later on, come  
13 up with individual tasks out of the general work that we discuss here in this document. So, we are  
14 not recommending any specific task. Of course, our main objectives will be to look at these big  
15 reports that are coming out, like the Record of , as far as cleanup goes on base, and so forth.

16  
17 So, what we would basically do is go out to—we have seven contractors that we have given  
18 Environmental Management. Two of them came through their organization and perhaps some of  
19 you know another contractor you'd like to submit to us, and that's fine. But anyhow, we will go  
20 out to those seven right now, eight if somebody else gives us another name, and ask them if they  
21 are interested in the Technical Assistance Program. And in this document, it generally explains  
22 what we are after. So they will come in with certain requirements that we list in here such as a...

23  
24 Unknown Female: Like experience?

25  
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Experience, yes. I was trying to think of the document you do  
27 submit when you seek employment.

1 Unknown Female: A resume?

2  
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: A resume, yes. I had that on the tip of my tongue. Well, anyhow, a  
4 resume or whatever. Basically, tell us what their experience is, what their education is, the  
5 amount they charge per document or per hour or whatever. Then they will come back to us  
6 telling us that they are interested and give us all this information. Then we will decide what  
7 different task we want. And we can actually break these companies out; for instance, this is what  
8 Kelly did. They came out with a list of certain contractors they wanted to study health; then they  
9 had another list for environmental. Out of those companies, they chose ones they wanted to do  
10 the work.

11  
12 But in our case, what we would do in most cases is go out with two recommendations. Let's say  
13 all seven come into us, or eight, whatever. If they all come back to us, we will look at their  
14 qualifications and their hourly rate and so forth. Then if we want a certain task, like the Record of  
15 Decision—there is a vital document that's due out—and so we would choose two out of the list  
16 of seven. We would then have them give us a formal bid on it, and the lowest one would win the  
17 contract.

18  
19 So basically, before we proceed, we have to have the majority of the RAB members agreeing this  
20 is the avenue we should take or pursue. I'd like to—and then we will go into discussion; we will  
21 get a motion here in a second and move on to discussion. You can get more questions out. So, I  
22 make a motion that the RAB proceed with seeking TAPP contractors and the TAPP grant itself.  
23 That's my motion. Do I have a second?

24  
25 Ms. Sheila Guerra: You have a second.

26  
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK, now I would like discussion so we can discuss it at length and  
28

1 answer all the questions we have here.

2  
3 Mr. Bill Sheppard: Chuck, Mr. Bill Sheppard. Have these two documents been  
4 reviewed by the Technical Report Review Committee yet?

5  
6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Only the one from Kelly. They rewrote that into this and, by the  
7 way, you're just giving us a stamp to proceed with it, this document. We will hold another  
8 meeting for the Technical Report Review Committee, give them enough time to study this, and  
9 then you or anybody else is welcome to come to the meeting. We will refine this down to what  
10 we actually want going out to the contractors but, right now, we just need sort of a formal stamp  
11 of approval.

12  
13 We have to have a majority vote from the RAB saying, "Yes, we agree and we want to proceed."  
14 So, any more discussion on this? Oh, by the way, there is an exception to going out with the  
15 competitive bid, and that is if we find out that there are certain tasks we want done and we feel  
16 there is only one company qualified to do them, a it is the only one we feel out of our seven  
17 companies that has full qualifications, then we have to justify why we want to just go to that one  
18 company.

19  
20 Just like McClellan Air Force Base would have to do with Radian or CH2M Hill or some other  
21 contractor that they do with their cleanup, we would have to do the same thing with our  
22 Technical Assistance Grant. But we could do that if we come upon that problem, yes?

23  
24 Mr. Bill Gibson: This is Bill Gibson. I have a question for contracting people. You  
25 also provide a request for "type of document" so that they...

26  
27 Ms. Linda Baustian: Are you speaking—Linda Baustian, contracting. Are you speaking  
28

1 to the six or seven, or whatever it ends up being, BPA members? The ones that you choose, the  
2 two, three, five, or all seven if you so choose, would get a copy of Request for Quote, yes.

3  
4 Mr. Bill Gibson: Yes, because we need to know their cost.

5  
6 Ms. Linda Baustian: Per hour.

7  
8 Mr. Bill Gibson: For a particular type of task, plus cost per hour?

9  
10 Ms. Linda Baustian: Per hour, exactly. They will come back and the basic BPA and I  
11 would identify things like hourly rates and anything else the RAB would like me to identify or  
12 that you may need a rate structure on. And that would be done in a basic document. What they  
13 would be actually quoting on the individual task is, like, say, their length of time to accomplish  
14 that task.

15  
16 Mr. Bill Gibson: Any travel time — things like that?

17  
18 Ms. Linda Baustian: Exactly, exactly.

19  
20 Mr. Bill Gibson: OK, so you have a standard format.

21  
22 Ms. Linda Baustian: We have a standard format. You got it.

23  
24 Mr. Bill Gibson: Thank you.

25  
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Any other questions? What I will do is contact all the RAB  
27 members and tell you when our next TAPP meeting will be. I don't want to do it tonight, so I  
28

1 will wait and hold off unless somebody wants a specific night. You can recommend it to me.

2  
3 Unknown Female: Want to take a vote? There was a motion.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, yes.

6  
7 Unknown Female: Discussion; there was no vote.

8  
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yeah, I know. I was still discussing. OK, we have a motion on the  
10 floor and it's been seconded. All in favor of pursuing their TAPP grant, raise your right hand.  
11 (Pause.) Thank you.

12  
13 Ms. Merianne Briggs: The vote is seven out of seven.

14  
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So, then, that's about all we have for the Technical Report Review  
16 Committee. So, we have a RAB advisory worksheet.

17  
18 **RAB Advisory Worksheet Report**

19  
20 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. We have four worksheets we wanted to discuss  
21 tonight. The first one was not actually put onto a worksheet, but we did get advice at the last  
22 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting on sampling frequency for Well 1019. We have put that  
23 onto a worksheet, and we have a response tonight where the BCT met and went over that advice.  
24 We would like to present tonight Captain George Joyce, who heads up our groundwater and soil  
25 vapor extraction efforts. He has a couple of slides to go over.

26  
27 Capt. George Joyce: Good evening. My name is Captain George Joyce. I work in  
28

1 Environmental Management and am responsible for the groundwater monitoring and the SVE  
2 Cleanup Program. The RAB, the last time I met, recommended that we increase sampling at  
3 monitor Well 1019. For those not familiar with the monitoring well, it's located out here in the  
4 northwest area of the base, right adjacent to a city production well, City Well 154. The  
5 recommendation was to increase the sampling frequency. The BCT met last week and evaluated  
6 the recommendation and made the determination that we would continue sampling it at its  
7 current frequency. They decided that for two reasons:

8  
9 The first was to support the existing statistical analysis process. Two years ago, we established a  
10 Groundwater Monitoring Program that created a decision logic such: that we have been sampling  
11 wells for over 13 years now. So for this particular well, we have a wealth of information; it has  
12 been sampled over 40 times. You see the one big spike in here and that's what I assume was the  
13 concern. But over the years, all these results, the "Z's" you see printed on here were below the  
14 maximum contaminant level – five parts per billion—until the second-to-last result here in  
15 February of '97. Because of that, the sampling frequency changed to semi-annual, because of that  
16 increase in the hit. So we would do sampling every six months. So the subsequent sample of that,  
17 we sampled again—it went from 21 parts per billion TCE to when we sampled it the third quarter  
18 of '97 back down to 0.8.

19  
20 So looking at that, it doesn't fit the trend. What we gathered from that was that it probably was  
21 due to some type of lab error or poor decontamination procedure in the field. So, when it dropped  
22 back down into the concentration range again, the decision logic or the statistical analysis said  
23 OK, now it's back in line. You can go back to sampling it on a two-year schedule. So, that's the  
24 first reason we went back.

25  
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: One thing you don't have up there—you don't have the other  
27 chemicals that are in there, too. All you have is TCE.

1 Capt. George Joyce: That's true.

2  
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And it had about 4 or 5 chemicals over the number of sampling.

4  
5 Capt. George Joyce: Had 4 or 5 chemicals that...

6  
7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That were in that particular monitoring well.

8  
9 Capt. George Joyce: Yes, all below the maximum contaminant level though.

10  
11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes, but what is it additional—what is the adding effect of  
12 multiplication there. What would that have to do with the health effect?

13  
14 Capt. George Joyce: The cumulative risk—none of them were over or close to the MCL.  
15 This is the first time.

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's just TCE.

18  
19 Capt. George Joyce: Yes.

20  
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: What about the other chemicals that were in there?

22  
23 Capt. George Joyce: The other chemicals were all so low that they didn't create a risk at  
24 the rate greater than MCL. The drinking water standard is for each individual contaminant.

25  
26 Ms. Imogene Zander: Do you drink it?

1 Capt. George Joyce: Yes, you can drink it.

2  
3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: No, she's asking do *you* drink it?

4  
5 Capt. George Joyce: Will *I* drink it?

6  
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Do you drink it?

8  
9 Ms. Imogene Zander: Do you drink it?

10  
11 Capt. George Joyce: I get my water from the city but—(inaudible) I'll drink it. They are  
12 required to sample their wells on a certain frequency as well for VOC, so if they found  
13 anything—the other thing, you're looking at a well that is screened at like 120 feet. The  
14 production well is probably 100 feet below that, so you are looking at different levels. Not only is  
15 this well adjacent to it, but it's at a much higher level. So what's actually being pulled from is  
16 probably—I'm sure is very much cleaner and they sample it. So, if there were any risks or they  
17 found any result, they are required to notify you.

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: How often do they sample it?

20  
21 Capt. George Joyce: This well? They are required to sample it...

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, no, I'm talking about the...

24  
25 Capt. George Joyce: City production well? At a minimum, they are required to sample it every  
26 three years for VOCs. Is that right, Alex? Isn't the city required to sample every three years for  
27 VOCs?



1 Mr. Alex MacDonald: It all depends...

2  
3 Capt. George Joyce: Unless they've seen contamination there prior.

4  
5 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Correct. That's the Department of Health Services Office of  
6 Drinking Water (inaudible) their frequency by the city, depending on—if there are plumes in the  
7 area, etc., they can modify that. But it is a minimal of every three years.

8  
9 Capt. George Joyce: So it could be more frequent if you are closer to contamination, but  
10 in this case they feel you are far enough from McClellan that it's not a problem. I will get to that  
11 in the second reason.

12  
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I was just—the multiple effects of these chemicals, were they taken  
14 into consideration at all when analyzing how frequently this well should be tested?

15  
16 Capt. George Joyce: This, no. The frequencies are dependent upon each individual  
17 contaminant and if we see a concentration change over time. This particular contaminant besides,  
18 at one point, was consistently below the maximum contaminant level. As for the rest of them...

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The other ones were consistent.

21  
22 Capt. George Joyce: They were all consistent just like that. That's why the well is  
23 sampled, or is recommended for a sampling frequency of every two years because it's  
24 consistently below and hasn't changed.

25  
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, I must admit I don't like that kind of thinking and right next  
27 to the city well—but I can't stop that. Go ahead.

1 Capt. George Joyce: And I will get to the other reason. The second reason is, as part of  
2 the Groundwater Monitoring Program process, there are three categories where you can differ  
3 from or not go with the statistical process, and those are for these three categories up here. You  
4 can change it to increase more frequently to a more frequent sampling by, if it was a boundary  
5 well, if it's a well located within 200 feet of the base boundary and was, again, downgradient of a  
6 known contamination plume, which doesn't fit the case for this example. If it's a downgradient  
7 well, located outside a downgrade of the plume so that it's in the flow direction of where you  
8 expect change to be dynamic and you'd want to sample more frequently to see if you were  
9 containing the plume. And, finally, if it was a guard well where location was relative to a private  
10 or municipal well and its location was relative to a plume migration pathway. And that's  
11 probably the closest that Monitoring Well 1019 comes to play. It does meet the first criteria; it is  
12 adjacent to a city well, but ...

13  
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Just a second here.

15  
16 Capt. George Joyce: Sure.

17  
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: You do have the flow of the groundwater underneath going to the  
19 southwest, I understand that.

20  
21 Capt. George Joyce: That's correct.

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: But you do have also — for instance, right there where 111, 112,  
24 113, that's right where Magpie Creek is.

25  
26 Capt. George Joyce: Yes.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And some of your maps, it shows a plume there. But I think it's  
2 one in a million cancer risk right there.

3  
4 Ms. Imogene Zander: It is.

5  
6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And that's right on Magpie Creek. And if you follow that creek, it  
7 comes right out of City Well 1019 — I mean your Monitoring Well — City Well 154,  
8 Monitoring Well 1019. So you have a plume there, although it's, like I said, one cancer risk and  
9 in one million. But then you're also testing that stream for — that's why we have a six-month  
10 delay and this evaluation of our wetlands area due to the fact that there is contamination along  
11 that creek that goes by the city well and also Monitoring Well 1019.

12  
13 Capt. George Joyce: And, Chuck, it may be a fact that there is contamination at the  
14 surface along the creek up in that area. But what we are concerned about is the contamination  
15 that is located at the depths of the city well, which is probably 200 feet below that. So whatever  
16 contamination it could make across that tortuous path of City Well 154 still has to infiltrate  
17 through 100 feet of soil, vadose zone, and then another 100 feet of groundwater down, or 200  
18 feet of groundwater down, to the city well where it's screened. So it's probably not a likely path  
19 of contamination.

20  
21 And the second reason — what I was getting at, the groundwater flow — the regional groundwater  
22 flow is in the southwesterly direction. And, actually, on the west side of the base it practically  
23 runs due south, and even back toward the east. So, monitoring Well 1019 is not really in the path  
24 of any plume contamination for McClellan Air Force Base. That's why it's not considered a  
25 guard well; it's not in the plume migration pathway.

26  
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Even with the city creek there, I mean the Magpie Creek going  
28

1 through there and, actually, it's not Robla or Rio Linda Creek joined just west of there that cuts  
2 across the northern part of the base?

3  
4 Capt. George Joyce: Again, the concentration would have to be high enough that it  
5 would be polluted by the time it reached City Well 154.

6  
7 Ms. Imogene Zander: That's not true—I mean, I just give up.

8  
9 Capt. George Joyce: What's not true? It would have to be—OK, say it wasn't diluted—any  
10 kind of contamination, a one-in-a-million risk made it up to City Well 154 at the surface; it still  
11 has to infiltrate a depth of 300 feet to reach that city production well, where that production well  
12 is screened and pulling water.

13  
14 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. You need to keep in mind, too, that the  
15 contaminants we are looking at in those creeks right now are not the same contaminants you're  
16 talking about here. You're talking about the volatile organics in the groundwater, the TCE, PCE-  
17 type contaminants. What we are looking at by the creeks are the metals, PCBs, pesticide-type  
18 contaminants. It's a different issue.

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I don't think the—well, any kind of contamination that gets into  
21 that well. I don't know—is that well tested for those things that she talked about? Should we be  
22 concerned with those things?

23  
24 Ms. Imogene Zander: Yes.

25  
26 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Chuck, if you look back at history, those wells are sampled—I  
27 don't know if that particular monitoring well was sampled for pesticides, but there were a  
28

1 number of wells sampled for pesticides and metals across the base and we don't really see that as  
2 a problem. Pesticides and metals do not migrate very well through the soil column, much less  
3 100 feet of soil column down to groundwater. As I said, in areas where we have prior metals, like  
4 on the landfill areas, we don't see those same metals down in the water tables. So, the effect on  
5 some infiltration from the creek sediments down to the water table, down to 200 feet down to the  
6 extraction wells are very unlikely. And also due to groundwater flow direction, if they did  
7 migrate down to the groundwater, it would be flowing back in the other direction.

8  
9 Capt. George Joyce: Right now, with the extraction wells on base, Chuck, the gradient  
10 groundwater is actually flowing back on base. It's no longer continuing to the west. All the  
11 extraction wells have been put in the Phase I and Phase II. Phase II is going to increase it more,  
12 such that the waters will be coming back on base even more.

13  
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I know that at one time the well, City Well 154, did have  
15 contamination at a very minute level. And I haven't seen the reports, so I can't tell you whether it  
16 still has it in it or not. I could get you that information, but it was a number of years ago, so I  
17 don't know what the current testing is.

18  
19 Mr. Alex MacDonald: If you look historically, Chuck, we used to sample all the  
20 residential wells out there. If you follow that data back to '85 and '86, you'll see a whole  
21 smattering of little hits of TCE ranging anywhere from 0.8 or so to 1 to 2 parts per billion. And  
22 part of the water is still sitting there, and that's why we still get hits in Monitoring Well 1019  
23 because that water is moving very slowly in any direction – 50 feet a year or so. It's like the  
24 contamination plume migrated out there, and that low concentration is still there. You'll probably  
25 still see it in Monitoring Well 1019 for who knows how long.

26  
27 We don't see additional migration from the base out in that direction to cause alarm saying,  
28

1 “Concentrations are jumping up; we need to take action.” If you take, say not just Well 1019 but  
2 all the other monitoring wells out in that area, you’ll see a similar trend if they are nondetect or  
3 very, very low concentration. And they have not changed.

4  
5 So, I would be very alarmed if I saw other indications that would say we have a plume moving  
6 off in that direction. As I said, we looked at all this data, went back through all the monitoring  
7 reports to see what was what, and what Captain Joyce has presented, I think, has been a good  
8 synopsis of what we saw.

9  
10 Ms. Imogene Zander: Well, I don’t know about you, but when frogs can’t even live—  
11 well, we live by the diversion ditch. There are no frogs, there is no life whatsoever in those  
12 creeks anymore. So, we had one of the universities do a test after we were told by the city how  
13 clean the water was and so forth. They were going to do a paper on it. They took water from  
14 there; they took soil from right in the yard. They took it down and were testing it, and the  
15 professor said, “Well, we don’t want to get entangled in this because it’s McClellan.” It was that  
16 bad. And the kids called and said, “We just had to let you know.”

17  
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Do you want to go on? I don’t know what else you have to present.

19  
20 Capt. George Joyce: No, those are the basic reasons why we chose to continue the  
21 sampling frequency. We felt it was adequate to monitor the migration of the plumes and we felt  
22 two years was an adequate sampling frequency based on the history of sampling we have done at  
23 that well.

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I just have to answer residents out there. I know they are going to  
26 ask me questions about why monitor wells are now on a two-year basis when they were promised  
27 that they would be monitored at least quarterly to protect them. So I just want to make sure I have  
28

1 my facts down straight. Any questions from the panel?

2  
3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I have a question. If for some reason you find some higher levels at  
4 one point, would you go back to quarterly or...?

5  
6 Capt. George Joyce: Absolutely. And, Sheila, that's what we showed on the graph when  
7 you saw that one spike. We went to sampling every six months, and that's what that statistical  
8 analysis does. When it sees something that falls out of that expectant concentration range, it  
9 increases the sampling frequency automatically. So we went out there six months later and  
10 sampled again. And once it fell back within that expectant concentration range that we have been  
11 used to seeing in the last 13 years, we decided, OK, that was just an anonymous result. That was  
12 probably some kind of laboratory error.

13  
14 But when we go to sample again in October and if we see that it spikes up again or it changes  
15 outside the expectant range, then, yes, we will sample more frequently.

16  
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Are you going to test another time in October? Is that what you're  
18 saying?

19  
20 Capt. George Joyce: Yes. The next time we sample is in October.

21  
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK, I can concur then.

23  
24 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. So, the next worksheet we have is—we do have  
25 an open worksheet with the RAB right now. It's on the Confirmed Site 10 and Potential Release  
26 Location 32 Cleanup Action. Those are two radiation sites that we are proposing a removal  
27 action on. It's due on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, so I just want to bring that up today. Hopefully, the RAB will have  
28

1 comments. If they have any additional ones beyond what we have already discussed tonight, the  
2 ones that you brought up, Chuck—earlier ones we have taken into advice. And we will be using  
3 that as we actually develop the plans on how we are going to take the contamination off the base.  
4

5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I don't believe we are going to have any more advice unless  
6 somebody else has something you want to advise on. We have already told them what we want  
7 them to do with the radiation. I just told you that earlier in the meeting. So, is there anybody else?  
8 Here's your opportunity to bring any comments you have regarding this low radioactive waste.  
9 OK.  
10

11 Mr. Mannard Gaines: My name is Mannard Gaines. I listened to what was said before  
12 about the two gates. And that's my recommendation. If they do that, I am in full agreement with  
13 that. I have nothing else against it.  
14

15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Very good, Mannard, I concur with you wholeheartedly.  
16

17 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: OK. The third one we had opened was at the last RAB Meeting.  
18 We did close out the RAB worksheet on the draft *Community Relations Plan*. And we gave you  
19 another worksheet asking for—did we incorporate your comments satisfactorily? And Sheila did  
20 give us back input that, yes, we had done that. So we will close that one out formally now.  
21

22 And the last one I put up there is—Del Callaway brought up at the last RAB when we were going  
23 through the worksheet. It was one that we had not closed out. I went back and pulled that up and  
24 it's Worksheet No. 01-09-01. It was done in the early part of '98 and it was a request from  
25 McClellan to the RAB. Did you want to participate in the TAPP and who is your recommended  
26 POC? We have gotten that answer back, and it's very clear you want to participate. Originally, I  
27 think it was Barry Bertrand who was named as the POC and then, later, Jeannie Lewis was  
28



1 named as the POC who we worked with. So, we consider that one closed, but I wanted to finish  
2 the loop on that because Del had brought up that one as outstanding.

3  
4 OK, that's all I have on the worksheets. We have the update now—Mr. Phil Mook to present on  
5 the IRP program.

## 6 7 **IRP AND WEST AREA UPDATE**

8  
9 Mr. Phil Mook: Good evening, my name is Phil Mook, and I will be giving the cleanup  
10 status report. I have an agenda within the agenda, another hidden agenda: field activities; our  
11 remedial managers decisions and issues; highlight the documents that have been in review the  
12 last quarter and the next quarter; and the West Area update. I think, Elaine, are you going to go  
13 ahead and do that last slide?

14  
15 Field activities. One thing I do want to point out is Jerry will be available after the meeting to  
16 discuss—he has a poster on ongoing field activities. These are the ones you'll see continuing  
17 quarter after quarter: soils and groundwater monitoring, groundwater treatment plan, and dual-  
18 phase system (those are our groundwater plants), SVE operations, and the quarterly inspection of  
19 the OU B1 cap, which is an Interim Record of Decision for containment of PCB contamination.

20  
21 This is a list of some more specific work that was done in the last quarter. We have our ongoing  
22 industrial waste line, lateral inspection and repair. We are 86% complete. And I believe it's the  
23 end of the month—is that the projected completion of the entire effort?

24  
25 PRL-T44, this is a soil vapor extraction that's in the northeast section of the base. It went  
26 operational in the last quarter. Groundwater Phase II Interim Record of Decision: the Phase II  
27 installs more wells and upgrades the treatment plant. The wells have been installed; the treatment  
28

1 plant upgrades are completed; and we are in the startup testing of that plant. That should be under  
2 way completely by the end of the month also.

3  
4 In remedial investigation, we finished the Phase II field work for OUs E through H. Now we are  
5 in the process of analyzing that data, and we will be producing the Phase II Remedial  
6 Investigation Characterization Summaries (RICS). We also started and completed an effort on  
7 looking at shallow soil gas in OU A, which is the industrial portion of the base down at the  
8 southeast end.

9  
10 That was last quarter. For next quarter, we are restarting our fuel lines inspection and repair  
11 project. This has been on hold because of the need to go out and get more funding. We keep  
12 finding fuel lines that aren't on any drawings.

13  
14 So, POL, the petroleum oils and lubricant inspection repairs. We are going to restart that effort—  
15 actually have restarted, I think, last week. Remedial investigations are going to start up in non-  
16 VOC, these were the metals and PCBs and other issues, mainly surface and landfill issues, and  
17 we need further characterization of the extent of that contamination.

18  
19 IC 35 SVE system will go operational during the next quarter. It is down in OU A, which is the  
20 southeast portion of the base again. And Phase II IROD, like I said, complete and ongoing before  
21 our next meeting.

22  
23 Documents for the last quarter. Elaine mentioned this earlier—our *Five-year review* and  
24 protectiveness determination has gone final. The *Community Relation Plan*, Sheila mentioned it,  
25 has gone final. We have SVE EE/CAs that are ongoing. In fact, I have a poster station, or actually  
26 it's George's poster station, over there on the *IC 30 EE/CA*, which has gone final. The next step  
27 is, after a 30-day public comment period, to put out an action memo which says we are going to  
28

1 take action at that site and then start the design and construction of that SVE system.

2  
3 That's just one of several that are in the queue right now, and the *CS-10 PRL-32 EE/CA* that we  
4 just talked about.

5  
6 Next quarter is scheduled to come out — the *Non-VOC Feasibility Study* in its draft form. This is  
7 similar to the *VOC FS*, which you have seen already, only it picks out the different set of  
8 contaminants. In addition to the *Non-VOC Feasibility Study*, the *VOC Feasibility Study* Draft  
9 Final No. 3 will be out this coming quarter. And more EE/CAs that are in the pipeline for the soil  
10 vapor extraction and a Non-VOC EE/CA—it's a little different than a feasibility study. It's like  
11 the SVE EE/CAs in that these are areas that we feel we can justify or need to justify an action  
12 prior to a Record of Decision.

13  
14 Issues for the remedial project managers: We have eco-risk assessments. This deals with the  
15 creeks; how we are going to handle that. Technical and economical feasibility analysis for SVE.  
16 This deals with when it is appropriate to turn off an SVE system. The non-VOC cleanup strategy  
17 is on there. That deals with the—actually that is a publication and submission of the *Non-VOCs*  
18 *Feasibility Study*. On that, we will start the discussions of our cleanup strategies and where we  
19 are headed on the non-VOCs. And that...

20  
21 **End of Tape**

22  
23 Mr. Jerry Vincent: Jerry Vincent, Environmental Management. We haven't removed  
24 any of the lines. We have made repairs on the lines and have made them since I started taking  
25 over the industrial waste line in 1992; it's been going on since 1988. The five-year plan in which  
26 we attacked the whole industrial waste line—there has been over a million dollars invested in  
27 upgrading that line. We have replaced the internal portions of the line by using a method called  
28

1 *in-situ*, where we pull the pipe inside there. But if you're referring to actually digging and  
2 removing and discarding any of the line, the answer is none.

3  
4 Mr. Frank Miller: Yes. In other words, my question is, in the industrial waste line, the  
5 main line, also lateral lines, were assessments made where you found that lines were dilapidated?  
6 Would it have been more cost-effective to just rip out the lines, considering that the base is  
7 closing and these lines may never be used again? So why should we waste taxpayers money to  
8 repair lines that may never be used again?

9  
10 Mr. Jerry Vincent: The lines right now, Frank, are in continual use. The industrial  
11 waste line has been converted over to a process water line and ties into the county sewer system.  
12 So we have taken Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant #1 off-line, but the lines are actively  
13 being used. All the buildings that were tied into that, which is 112 buildings, are still actively  
14 discharging water into those lines. So there is not a method or a process where we can just  
15 eliminate the lines. They are still necessary to carry on the Air Force mission.

16  
17 The inspection of those lines are part of a five-year plan that we signed up with the State of  
18 California. We agreed that we would inspect and maintain the integrity of those lines until the  
19 Air Force no longer uses the system at all. And to the best of my knowledge, I'm still  
20 programming funding for those inspections until the year 2000, when we will no longer own the  
21 property. Does that answer your question, Frank?

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So, did I hear you say that, what I understand is that this line isn't  
24 going to be decommissioned?

25  
26 Mr. Jerry Vincent: No. Basically our charter in EM has been to maintain the integrity  
27 of that line out to the end of the Air Force owning the infrastructure of the base. When the base  
28

1 property gets transferred over to the county in 2001, then that responsibility will go to the county  
2 if they continue or they opt to use that line as a conveyance piping for the buildings that are now  
3 tied into it.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I thought the whole idea was that that line wasn't going to be used  
6 again, that you were going to take another service along with the industrial treatment plant on the  
7 other side of the base, on the west side of the base.

8  
9 Mr. Jerry Vincent: That's never been conveyed to me as a requirement. The  
10 requirement, to clarify a little bit, Chuck, was that we are going into buildings that no longer have  
11 a need to tie into there and we are capping or removing the capabilities of tying into that line,  
12 which is basically pressure grouting the lines. But as long as there is an active requirement to use  
13 the line, the integrity of the line is maintained so that there is no potential for contaminants  
14 leaching out of it. So, it's as good if not better than any sewer line that we have on the base,  
15 mainly because we give it much "TLC." We give it a lot of care and oversight and repair, and the  
16 Air Force has invested a lot of money to maintain that integrity.

17  
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So there are no plans to remove it?

19  
20 Mr. Jerry Vincent: No, none that I know of.

21  
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you.

23  
24 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. The last slide we have here is the West Area  
25 update. Rick Solander, during his briefing, mentioned this earlier that in the fire training area  
26 there is a section we have identified as a possible vernal pool, so we have fenced that area off.  
27 We are working now with the people who want to license that area as to how they can use it and  
28

1 what the restrictions are, as well as having the Corps of Engineers make a determination as to its  
2 actual status. So we have been working that one.

3  
4 We did have the Creek Week cleanup on base take place. Upcoming work is that by June 1 we  
5 will be trying to accomplish the firebreaks. So that's what will be taking place by the time we  
6 meet next.

7  
8 Then we'll move on to the Community Bulletin Board.

9  
10 **OTHER BUSINESS**

11  
12 **Community Bulletin Board**

13  
14 Ms. Merianne Briggs: OK. Merianne Briggs. Quickly, for the Community Bulletin Board,  
15 we are going to be having a creek and vernal pool tour as our last event in recognition of Earth  
16 Week. That is tomorrow. We have very limited seating on the bus. We have less than seven seats  
17 left on the bus, so if you are interested there is a sign-up sheet over here at the first table, the first  
18 poster board station. So please sign up if you're interested.

19  
20 Also, I'd like to say the newsletter for this quarter is late. It was held up because we were waiting  
21 to put in the latest information we had on the restoration project, the EA, and the FONSI. So  
22 there is a little bit of information in the newsletter on that. It did go to print, came back from the  
23 printer and there were some print errors on it. So we did go ahead and reject that newsletter — it  
24 is back at the printer's, and he is going ahead and printing it at no cost. So we should be able to  
25 get those out next week.

26  
27 Also, the final *Community Relations Plans* are here and we will be getting those out. You should  
28

1 be receiving those next week also.

2  
3 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: OK, the other item I had here was that we do have a training  
4 workshop scheduled for May 6 (*Editors note: The training date was changed and held on May 5.*  
5 *A notice was sent to the RAB members.*) at 6:30. It will be on Institutional Controls, and Linda  
6 Hogg from DTSC will be giving that training session. Will be talking about what are those  
7 restrictions that have to be put in place on property if you're leaving contamination, and it's  
8 going to be a concern in the future.

9  
10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: What time is that going to be?

11  
12 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: I have 6:30 as the time to start the training session. The location  
13 should be here, correct?

14  
15 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Yes it is.

16  
17 Mr. Mannard Gaines: May, what?

18  
19 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: It's on May 6. (*Editors note: The training date was changed and*  
20 *held on May 5. A notice was sent to the RAB members.*)

21  
22 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: The location will be here at the school, but we will be out front or  
23 someone will be around to let you know whether it will be in this room or in Classroom 4. It will  
24 be in one of the two locations. What we try to do with the Vineland School and the folks here is  
25 work with them. If we have a small group, use a small room, so they will have this room  
26 available.

1 **Next RAB Agenda Topics?**

2  
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. Next RAB agenda. You have topics that you would like to  
4 bring up at this time for our next RAB Meeting, which will be June — does anyone have a date  
5 of that?

6  
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: June 3.

8  
9 Ms. Merianne Briggs: June 2 is the next RAB.

10  
11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: June 2. So does anyone have an agenda topic that you'd like to be  
12 brought up? If not, we will continue working on it until that meeting occurs on the 2<sup>nd</sup>.

13  
14 OK, so why don't we at this time review the current action items, recap those that have come up  
15 tonight.

16  
17 **Recap Current Action Items**

18  
19 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: OK, I have two. One is contact Erwin Hayer to get his resignation  
20 in writing. The other one is invite the two RAB applicants to the next Community Relations  
21 Meeting, which will be on May 16 (*Editors note: The CR meeting will be held on June 16*). Are  
22 there any others you would like to have?

23  
24 Ms. Merianne Briggs: We have an action for all the committees to elect their chairs by the  
25 July RAB.

26  
27 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: We will add the action to have all committees elect their chair by  
28



1 the July RAB. Are there any others? OK, those will be the action items. Thank you.

2  
3 **PUBLIC COMMENT AND QUESTIONS**  
4

5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. We are at the public comment and questions part of our RAB  
6 Meeting. So if anyone has something that they would like to bring up...?

7  
8 Ms. Merianne Briggs: May I please remind everyone to step up to the microphone, state  
9 your name for the record, and also please hold your comments to three minutes. Thank you.  
10

11 Mr. Frank Miller: Frank Miller. Comment in question to Captain George. With  
12 respect to Well 1019 and the TCE spike, you said it was probably—he said that it was probably a  
13 lab error. I take it that you have not one shred of evidence that says it was a lab error? What  
14 checking did you do to confirm that it could have been a lab error? And what lab did it?  
15

16 Ms. Imogene Zander: He only says what he is told to.  
17

18 Capt. George Joyce: Captain George Joyce. The shred of evidence—it was done at a  
19 Radian contract lab. And we have QA/QC results that did not prove that there was a lab error  
20 made. We can only guess that it was a result of lab error or contamination procedure.  
21

22 Mr. Frank Miller: OK then, Captain, you are just guessing that it was a lab error?  
23

24 Capt. George Joyce: That's correct.  
25

26 Mr. Frank Miller: You just guess. I hope it was a lab error.  
27  
28

1 Capt. George Joyce: We are not guessing. We are looking at a history of contamination  
2 taken over—an educated guess. A history of samples taken over 13 years and this is the first time  
3 it's exceeded the MCL by an order of magnitude compared to the other results.

4  
5 Mr. Frank Miller: You said it was a Radian contract.

6  
7 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Please speak into the microphone. Thank you.

8  
9 Ms. Imogene Zander: Turn it on.

10  
11 Mr. Frank Miller: When Radian farmed out this work, who did they farm it out to?

12  
13 Capt. George Joyce: Radian personnel collected the sample and it was sent to Radian's  
14 laboratory.

15  
16 Mr. Frank Miller: Did you follow up with the laboratory technicians? What  
17 investigation did you conduct to find out whether there was any possible laboratory  
18 contamination that caused that spike? What investigation did you carry out?

19  
20 Capt. George Joyce: The normal quality assurance and quality control techniques were  
21 followed in that they take a look and they take 10% field duplicate samples, or they take  
22 equipment blank samples, to check and see if there were errors introduced in either the way it  
23 was sampled in the field or the way that maybe the solutions were diluted at the lab so that the  
24 lab could read it, because they get a range of very low concentration samples to very high  
25 concentration samples.

26  
27 One of the field problems—field corrections that we did make right after that quarter was to  
28

1 make sure when we sampled in our sampling routines, and we go out and sample typically a  
2 hundred or so wells, that we sample from the least contaminated well to the most contaminated  
3 well. So that we don't introduce, when we are decontaminating the field sampling equipment,  
4 that we don't introduce something that was a higher contamination in one well and go to a low  
5 well and possibly cross-contaminate the next well we sample. That was a correction we now  
6 have in our procedure, so you won't be able to introduce that type of error, typically.

7  
8 Mr. Frank Miller: So that TCE spike was probably a true reading?

9  
10 Unknown Female: True.

11  
12 Capt. George Joyce: It could be a true reading in that there was contamination left over  
13 from the equipment, yes, but not associated with that well.

14  
15 We hoped we can prove or substantiate this fact more with another subsequent sample. We went  
16 back and sampled again. In fact the Regional Water Quality Control Board took a split sample  
17 when we went back and sampled again to verify that there is, indeed, no contamination in that  
18 well, or it is the low contamination you find in that well.

19  
20 Mr. Frank Miller: And if...

21  
22 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Please speak into the microphone so we can pick this up.

23  
24 Mr. Frank Miller: And if it was laboratory contamination, as you suggest, there would  
25 have been other samples that would have turned up with high spikes also. But yet, this was the  
26 only one.

1 Capt. George Joyce: I can't say this was not the only one, and we don't know for sure  
2 how the error could have been introduced. What we do know is that when we went back and  
3 resampled, the correction was made and we did get the expected results again, and that was  
4 verified.

5  
6 Mr. Frank Miller: So you got the expected result. You mean, they want to get an  
7 expected result, right? They are looking for those below MCL levels. And when you get a high  
8 spike, then you throw it out and you say you guess that it was lab error.

9  
10 Capt. George Joyce: What happened, Frank, and this is something that we need to  
11 clarify, too, that Sheila brought up. When we say that we recommend sampling this every two  
12 years, that's not a static recommendation that we will sample this well every two years forever.  
13 The Groundwater Monitoring Program is a dynamic process. If we see a change in the  
14 concentration, it triggers you to sample it more frequently, and that's exactly what happened. We  
15 sampled it at six months instead of two years later. So the sampling algorithms that are in there,  
16 the statistical analysis was done, does work. That's why we sampled it again sooner rather than  
17 waiting two years.

18  
19 So if we see another—if we see it increase again—then, yes, the sampling will increase. But if it  
20 does fall within that expected range that we have seen over the last 13 years, then we will  
21 continue sampling at two-year intervals. We just know that when looking at the graph, you can  
22 see for yourself it does look odd, that over the last 40 samples we have taken, all of a sudden, we  
23 have something that jumped off the graph. So that's an indication that there was probably some  
24 error.

25  
26 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: We have gone beyond the three minutes. I ask the Chair if we  
27 would like to move to the next participant or continue this discussion?

1 Mr. Frank Miller: Well, Captain George has taken up some of the time, but yet, in  
2 conclusion, you're willing to accept just one track record sample that comes back within MCL.  
3 And you're willing to accept that after a spike, and I think that that's too hasty a judgment. In  
4 conclusion, I think you ought to sample that well at least once every year, at least on an annual  
5 basis and not a three-year basis.

6  
7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I would concur with a one-year sampling basis, but I don't think  
8 that they are going to necessarily buy our opinion.

9  
10 Mr. Frank Miller: That ought to be done on an annual basis, considering it's right  
11 next to a city well.

12  
13 Unknown Male: They are doing it every six months, Frank.

14  
15 Mr. Frank Miller: No.

16  
17 Ms. Imogene Zander: No, they are not.

18  
19 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Two years.

20  
21 Ms. Imogene Zander: Two years.

22  
23 Unknown Male: He said he was going to sample it this coming October.

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That'll be good.

26  
27 Unknown Male: When was the last sample?

1 Capt. George Joyce: The last sample was in '97, so in October of this year when we  
2 sample again it would have been two years since the last time we sampled. So if it falls within  
3 the range that we have seen for the last 13 years, it will continue to be sampled every two years.  
4 If we see something similar to what happened the time before, then we will increase the sampling  
5 to adjust for that. The sampling program is set up to do that, so if you do see things that do not  
6 fall within what you expect, you will sample more frequently.

7  
8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The only problem is, what you're stating there, is not what was  
9 promised the public back when you started sampling the monitoring wells in the first place,  
10 which I don't like. And I must admit that I don't like it, but I think you ought to do it at least  
11 annually.

12  
13 Capt. George Joyce: Chuck, I don't know exactly...

14  
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's my own personal opinion.

16  
17 Capt. George Joyce: I think you all were—the RAB was a reviewer on the Groundwater  
18 Monitoring Program. And you all agreed on the process that we determined for the sampling  
19 frequencies. So the promises made to the public—I'm not sure what you're referring to, but I  
20 know...

21  
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: One of the criteria was that public opinion would step in here, too.  
23 And that would be a criteria that I haven't even heard you state yet tonight.

24  
25 Capt. George Joyce: It is a criteria and we looked at the recommendation you made, but  
26 we feel that—there are three categories...

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I have a right to disagree with what you come up with.

2  
3 Capt. George Joyce: You certainly do, and so does the Air Force.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I just said I did, and I would have to ask the public.

6  
7 Ms. Imogene Zander: And so the Air Force will do exactly what they want to, when they  
8 want to, and nobody is about to get anything in sideways—so thank you very much.

9  
10 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Might I suggest that since this is the public comment period, that  
11 we allow each public member who does want to comment an opportunity and then, if there is  
12 more time to re-address these issues, we can do that or perhaps after. But I would suggest...

13  
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: This is fine. We have gone far enough with this item, so we can  
15 take the next.

16  
17 Mr. Frank Miller: The next issue is regarding...

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Hold it just a second, Frank. You can come back and address after  
20 the next public member has a chance. Then you can come up and bring your other point up, OK?  
21 I will give you more time. Come on, Gary.

22  
23 Mr. Gary Collier: Back before the private club again here. My comments tonight are  
24 not to the RAB itself and its entirety, however, to the federal representatives who will be reading  
25 this document and the minutes.

26  
27 As you noticed, I do have a rather colorful tie on today. It happens to be pictures of sewage  
28

1 flowing down a street in Sacramento. Unfortunately, the federal government is handing over the  
2 base and, unfortunately, the Local Reuse Authority has made a decision that they are not going to  
3 include areas outside the base on the west side of the base in redevelopment.

4  
5 This is atrocious public policy. We are going to see buildings on the east side of the base  
6 renovated, particularly the housing area, and yet a formerly utilized defense site is not going to be  
7 renovated. It's not going to be entitled the same opportunities to revitalize in the community.  
8 And this street just happens to have the name of Lieutenant Kelly who perished in World War II.  
9 Is that the way the Air Force wants to honor its heroes?

10  
11 They have an opportunity to engage in discourse with the LRA and say, "Hey, you guys are the  
12 ones that dropped the ball, County. You didn't follow through. You had no oversight when we  
13 gave you the land back in 1947. You allowed it to fall into private hands. It's your fault. Use your  
14 tax increment, form the redevelopment area, include these areas that have had the greatest  
15 impact." And believe me, if they don't, when it comes time for the FAA to review the club, these  
16 issues will be coming up as environmental justice issues. And I will be quite luciferous. Thank  
17 you very much.

18  
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Mark, do you want to address anything Gary said here?

20  
21 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Excuse me one moment, Chuck. That was Gary Collier, and I just  
22 want to make sure we have his name for the record. Thank you.

23  
24 Mr. Gary Collier: I'm sorry.

25  
26 Mr. Mark Manoff: Yes, Mark Manoff, with Sacramento County. Gary, I have spoken  
27 to you before. The issue of the redevelopment area has yet to be determined, so I'm not really  
28



1 sure what Mr. Collier is referring to. We are going to, as part of our final reuse planning process,  
2 look at the whole base as a redevelopment area and possibly outside the boundaries. So, on that  
3 issue, I don't know what else to say except it hasn't been decided yet.

4  
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So other areas outside the base could be included in the  
6 redevelopment area?

7  
8 Mr. Mark Manoff: Absolutely. We have discussed this issue before, Gary.

9  
10 Mr. Gary Collier: I'm sorry. I thought that was going to be the end of it.

11  
12 Conversations that have been going between the city, myself, as well as with the Board of  
13 Supervisors, Roger Dickinson, have indicated that we will not be included, that they are very  
14 resistant against including us. That is my intent here: to make sure the federal government,  
15 particularly the Department of Defense, is aware that the LRA is not bearing up to the spirit of  
16 the agreement to protect the community at large. They are focusing on the east side of the base to  
17 what I can see.

18  
19 The secrecy that has occurred in the last two years is inordinately against the west side of the  
20 base. Not just myself, many people in the community—as Mr. Manoff is well aware, he's  
21 attended a meeting recently where many people are expressing dismay that they are not being  
22 notified in the public regarding these issues. I would hope that the county would rectify that  
23 situation and make sure that organizations are made aware and are notified on a regular basis for  
24 future actions. Thank you.

25  
26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I'd like to comment on that, Gary, just for a second. I have been speaking  
27 with the county and the Board of Supervisors on certain issues on the west side of the base. For  
28

1 example, the example would be creating the back side of the base—the back door would look  
2 like the front door. They have lead me to believe that there will be federal funding for the west  
3 end of the base. I mean, that's the way I heard it, so I thought maybe that was their intent.  
4

5 Mr. Gary Collier: We are very concerned that Congressman Matsui has been vacant,  
6 AWOL, regarding this community. We have asked him to come to meetings; he has not come,  
7 and these are public meetings with the Brown Act and the whole nine yards. He has not chosen to  
8 come or send staff. We have repeatedly requested assistance from a variety of federal and local  
9 agencies to finally address the issues that are so paramount to our area.  
10

11 And we believe that we are being neglected in our area and people in Del Paso Heights, as well,  
12 have indicated they are not being told what's going on. That is where I'm coming from—where I  
13 say, "Hey, we want to have information." If you make decisions in a vacuum, you're going to  
14 have tyranny and you're going to have poor decisions.  
15

16 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Well, maybe after the decision is made on the reuse for the bidders,  
17 the Planning Committee will come back. This is the way I understand it: When that planning  
18 committee comes back, then the public can give more input on what's going on as far as the  
19 vision to the reuse after that point.  
20

21 Mr. Gary Collier: I agree with LRA. It is premature to have a total vision of what's  
22 going on out there. I don't want to be an obstructionist. Everyone wants the economical activity  
23 to occur out there, and that's not where I'm at with this. However, what we are seeing here is the  
24 emphasis on — now it's Congressman Ose's district and not any focus on the area that is  
25 Congressman Matsui's district.  
26

27 So, where I'm trying to focus my attention is, we haven't had representation. We are not getting  
28

1 notified. The federal government — the Air Force was very good about this during the process of  
2 the EIR. The LRA, I'm sorry, they need to improve dramatically in terms of public noticing.

3  
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, Gary, I just have one comment concerning what you're  
5 saying here. I had a phone call from City Councilman Rob Kerth, and he told me that Parker  
6 Homes and about four other areas, pocket areas or whatever you want to say, that the city is  
7 going to address bringing them into the local—I mean the Redevelopment Agency from  
8 McClellan Air Force Base proper. In other words, he's going to suggest to the county that they—  
9 if they haven't already done this, they might have done it—that they bring in these areas,  
10 including Parker Homes, into the Redevelopment Agency.

11  
12 Mr. Gary Collier: Yes, I'm well aware of that; however, that's asking and the  
13 problem is they are saying the tax increments they don't want to be involved in it. They are  
14 saying, "Fine, you form your redevelopment area, but we don't have an area." Everybody has  
15 said before that we are too small of an area, and they weren't talking about my height. They are  
16 talking about the area doesn't have the tax increment base to support redevelopment activities;  
17 that's the problem. We don't even have the tax increment base to support the planning step,  
18 much less to do anything. That's the problem.

19  
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, the man standing right there with the answer, is right there.

21  
22 Mr. Gary Collier: Great. I'm willing to have discourse, but at this point we haven't  
23 had any in two years.

24  
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Is that possible, what I just stated?

26  
27 Mr. Mark Manoff: Well, one of the action items at the last RAB Reuse was—Gary  
28

1 you were there at the previous meeting—to set up a meeting with the city and the county, Roger  
2 Dickinson and Rob Kerth and the LRA, to sit down and talk about this issue, particularly Parker  
3 Homes being included in the redevelopment area.

4  
5 To me, it's premature, as far as what Gary is talking about it. It hasn't been established yet. We  
6 have a work program that includes the establishment of a redevelopment area. The west side, we  
7 are seeking federal funds for redevelopment or economic development funds for improvement of  
8 the warehouse and the microelectronics area. So that's basically what...

9  
10 Mr. Gary Collier: Well, let's hope so, and we will see what the future holds.

11  
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. Thank you very much. Now, Frank, you had another issue?

13  
14 Mr. Frank Miller: Frank Miller. With regard to the TAPP program, I hope that the  
15 potential TAPP consultant—I hope that you will investigate that consultant and make sure he is  
16 not tied in with contractors and that there is no conflict of interest, and that he is not a former  
17 regulator of some sort and that you're not contracting with a clone who has a conflict of interest  
18 and who is trying to get business for some other contractor.

19  
20 So I hope—to do the job right, will require some investigation on your part. To investigate the  
21 CVs and their educational background and what courses they took, what engineering courses they  
22 took, and what they know about flow through porous media, etc. And that's about it. And,  
23 Chuck, would you address that to make sure that the contractor will be investigated so that he is  
24 completely independent?

25  
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: We are going to try to do that, Frank. By the way, what do you  
27 mean by clone, a clone of another contractor that works for McClellan or what? Or works on  
28

1 McClellan projects?

2  
3 Mr. Frank Miller: Well, a contractor who has ties with another contractor, who may  
4 be a subcontractor of a contractor, because these McClellan contractors are farming work out to  
5 other smaller contractors.

6  
7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: But you're talking about someone that's a clone of a contractor that  
8 McClellan now employs?

9  
10 Unknown Female: Right

11  
12 Mr. Frank Miller: Right.

13  
14 **CLOSING REMARKS/ADJOURN**

15  
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you. Any other public  
17 comments? If not, I would move that we adjourn. And do I have a second here?

18  
19 Ms. Imogene Zanders: I second.

20  
21 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I second.

22  
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK, this meeting is now adjourned.

24  
25 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Oh, by the way, does anybody want one of the copies of the  
26 bidders? You can come and pick up a copy from me. (Pause.) I guess nobody's interested.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28